



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/477,389	01/04/2000	Andrew Ramsay Knox	UK9-99-004	9176

25299 7590 04/03/2003

IBM CORPORATION
PO BOX 12195
DEPT 9CCA, BLDG 002
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

8

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/477,389

Applicant(s)

KNOX ET AL.

Examiner

Kenny Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4 are presented for examination. Claims 5-12 have been cancelled by the applicant in paper 7.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. code not included in this office action can be found in prior office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson et al, U.S. Patent Number 6,052,779.
4. Jackson et al was cited in the previous office action.
5. As per claim 1, Jackson et al taught the invention substantially as claimed including a data processing network (col.2, lines 3-12) comprising:
 - a. A server computer system (col.2, lines 3-12, col.3, lines 16-19);
 - b. A portable client computer system capable of communicating with said server computer system (col.2, lines 3-12, col.3, lines 16-29);
 - c. A control means, connected to said server computer system, for issuing a wake-up request to said portable client computer system via a connection to switch said portable client computer system to a normal operating state from a low-power or off state, and for issuing a request to said portable client computer system via said

Art Unit: 2154

connection to disable said portable client computer system (col.2, lines 3-12, col.4, lines 28-37, 58-65, col.5, lines 2-27, 38-42, col.8, lines 22-31); and

- d. A network adapter, connected to said portable client computer system, for disabling said portable client computer system from further operations in response to said request (col.2, lines 28-37, col.5, lines 2-27).

6. Jackson et al did not specifically teach that the communication between the server and the client is wireless and the request is issued via a wireless connection. However, Jackson et al did mention that the connection between the controlling system and the client computer system could be of other arrangement (col.3, lines 16-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the network to wireless connections, such as wireless LAN, to Jackson et al's system to enable communications to the client computer system when no physical network connection is available.

7. As per claim 4, Jackson et al taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Jackson et al further taught that the wherein the wake-up request includes a Wake-on-LAN frame (col.4, lines 28-38).

8. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson et al, U.S. Patent Number 6,052,779, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of McCain et al, U.S. Patent Number 6,052,779.

9. McCain was cited in the previous office action.

10. As per claim 2, Jackson et al taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Jackson et al did not specifically teach that the wireless connection is a satellite data link. McCain et al taught a data communication system to use satellite data link to provide data interchange (col.1, lines 42-44, col.2, lines 16-20, 52-55). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Jackson et al and McCain et al because McCain et al's teaching of using satellite data link as the wireless connection would provide a network control function for all devices in Jackson et al's system.

11. Claim 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson et al, U.S. Patent Number 6,052,779, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Spicer, U.S. Patent Number 6,097,760.

12. Spicer was cited in the previous office action.

13. As per claim 3, Jackson et al taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Jackson et al did not specifically teach that the wireless connection is a DECT link. Spicer taught a data communication system using a DECT link as the wireless connection between the controlling system and the client computer system (col.1, lines 51-58, col.2, lines 12-14, 57-63, col.3, lines 61-65). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to combine the teachings of Jackson et al and Spicer because Spicer's teaching of using DECT link as the wireless connection enables Jackson et al's system for use in a radio in a local loop system.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, filed on 2/7/2003, have been fully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive.

15. In the remark, applicant argued that Jackson et al fails to teach "a control means ... for issuing a request to said portable client computer system via said satellite link to disable said portable client computer system" and "a network adapter ... for disabling said portable client computer system from further operations in response to said request."

16. Examiner respectfully traverses applicant's remark.

- a. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., satellite link) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
- b. Furthermore, Jackson et al taught a control mean and a network adapter (see claim 1 rejection above).

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-0438. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tuesday to Friday and every other Monday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (703)305-9678. Additionally, the fax numbers for Group 2100 are as follows:

Official Responses: (703) 746-7239

After Final Responses: (703) 746-7238

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-5140.

ksl
April 1, 2003


ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER